PTEP

Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. **2015**, 00000 (7 pages)
DOI: 10.1093/ptep/0000000000

Gravity loop corrections to the standard model Higgs in Einstein gravity

Yugo Abe[a], Masaatsu Horikoshi[a,*], and Takeo Inami[b]

[a] *Department of Physics, Shinshu University, Matsumoto 390-8621, Japan*
[b] *Mathematical Physics Lab., Riken Nishina Center, Saitama 351-0198, Japan*
[b] *Department of Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan*
[*] *E-mail: 14st307b@shinshu-u.ac.jp*

arXiv:1602.03792v3 [hep-ph] 21 Jun 2016

We study one-loop quantum gravity corrections to the standard model Higgs potential $V(\phi)$ à la Coleman-Weinberg and examine the stability question of $V(\phi)$ in the energy region of Planck mass scale, $\mu \simeq M_{\rm Pl}$ ($M_{\rm Pl} = 1.22 \times 10^{19}$GeV). We calculate the gravity one-loop corrections to $V(\phi)$ in Einstein gravity by using the momentum cut-off Λ. We have found that even small gravity corrections compete with the standard model term of $V(\phi)$ and affect the stability argument of the latter part alone. This is because the latter part is nearly zero in the energy region of $M_{\rm Pl}$.

Subject Index B53,E05

It is curious that the mass of the recently discovered Higgs boson $M_{\rm H}$ lies far outside of the mass bound derived from the one-loop radiative corrections [1, 2]. This bound arises from the stability condition on the Higgs quartic coupling λ, i.e. $\lambda(\mu) > 0$.

The large two-loop corrections come into play and the renormalization group (RG) flows of $\lambda(\mu)$ change drastically. Some fine-tuning of the parameters, especially that of $M_{\rm t}$ ($= 173.21 \pm 0.51\,{\rm GeV}$), yield $\lambda(\mu)$ barely in accord with the boundary values of the stability bound extended to the scales of Planck mass $M_{\rm Pl}$ [3–5]. This implies an interesting possibility that the standard model (SM) may hold all the way up to the Planck scale $M_{\rm Pl}$ [6–8]. This suggestion is compatible with the so far vain results of the SUSY particle search at the LHC experiment and no experimental hints of GUT.

It is a common belief that quantum gravity effects should manifest itself near Planck energy scales. Possible significance of gravity effects has recently been studied in a few different approaches; gravity loop corrections to the ϕ^6 and ϕ^8 terms in $V(\phi)$ in [9], the correction to the Higgs coupling λ in [10], both in Einstein gravity and using the cut-off Λ reguralization. Gravity effects have also been studied by some use of string theory [11].

In this letter, we consider the graviton one-loop corrections in addition to the SM one- and two-loop corrections. Of course the gravity one-loop corrections are small, with a coefficient of the order $(1/16\pi^2)(\kappa^2\mu^2) \simeq 1/10$ for $\mu \simeq M_{\rm Pl}$ (the factor $1/16\pi^2$ due to the one-loop integral). However, if the standard model $V(\phi)$ becomes nearly zero at Planck scales, as advocated by many [12, 13], there is a chance that small gravity corrections may upset the SM contribution. The gravity two-loop effects are likely to be smaller for the above values of Λ (to show this is an interesting question, but it is beyond this work), and will not be

© The Author(s) 2012. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Physical Society of Japan.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

considered. We are concerned about one-loop gravity effects in some energy range of Planck mass scale $M_{\rm Pl}$. It is conceivable that the one-loop gravity effects is small but noticeable in this energy range while two-loop effects may still be small there. When we often say near the Planck energy $M_{\rm Pl}$, we mean $(0.1\text{ - }0.5)M_{\rm Pl} \leq E \leq (1.2\text{ - }1.5)M_{\rm Pl}$.

After taking account of the ϕ^6 and ϕ^8 terms in $V(\phi)$ due to gravity one-loops, the sign of λ alone is not enough to answer to the stability question of the Higgs potential $V(\phi)$ near the Planck energy scales, $\phi \simeq M_{\rm Pl}$. Hence we have to study the shape of $V(\phi)$ in the region of $\phi \simeq M_{\rm Pl}$, and have found that $V(\phi)$ with the ϕ^6 and ϕ^8 terms is stable in this region.

We are aware that computing gravity loop corrections in Einstein gravity (UV non-renormalizable theory) is accompanied by some cut-off Λ dependence. We still think it is important to know whether gravity loop corrections to the Higgs potential may affect the results in the SM recently obtained at Planck mass scales [9, 10, 13]. On the other hand, we should see whether the Λ dependence is rather mild so that we can say some thing useful for the study of the SM in this energy region.

We derive the Higgs effective potential $V(\phi)$ in the framework of SM coupled to Einstein's gravity theory, the Coleman-Weinberg procedure [14]. We begin by writing the following action,

$$S = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\left[-\frac{2}{\kappa^2}R + g^{\mu\nu}(\partial_\mu H)^\dagger(\partial_\nu H) - m^2H^\dagger H - \lambda(H^\dagger H)^2 + \cdots\right], \tag{1}$$

where $\kappa \equiv \sqrt{32\pi G} = \sqrt{32\pi}M_{\rm Pl}^{-1}$, $g \equiv \det g_{\mu\nu}$, $g_{\mu\nu}$ is the metric and H is the Higgs doublet field. The ellipsis show the terms of gauge and fermion fields. Expanding the Higgs doublet around the background field ϕ as $H^\dagger = 1/\sqrt{2}\,(\sigma_1 - i\pi_1, \phi + \sigma_2 - i\pi_2)$ and the metric around the Minkowski background as $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + \kappa h_{\mu\nu}$, we evaluate the gravity corrections to the tree level Higgs potential

$$V_{\rm tree} = \frac{m^2}{2}\phi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi^4. \tag{2}$$

We take the de Donder gauge fixing term $\mathcal{L}_{\rm gf}$. It is given in the Minkowski background by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm gf} = -\eta_{\alpha\beta}\left(\eta^{\mu e}\eta^{\nu\alpha} - \frac{1}{2}\eta^{\mu\nu}\eta^{e\alpha}\right)\left(\eta^{\rho f}\eta^{\sigma\beta} - \frac{1}{2}\eta^{\rho\sigma}\eta^{f\beta}\right)h_{\mu\nu,e}h_{\rho\sigma,f}. \tag{3}$$

The gravity one-loop corrections to the potential $V_{\rm tree}$ have been obtained in the momentum cut-off method [9, 12, 13],

$$\begin{aligned}\delta V_{\rm loop} =& \frac{5\kappa^2\Lambda^2}{32\pi^2}\left(\frac{m^2}{2}\phi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi^4\right) + \frac{9\kappa^4}{256\pi^2}\left(\frac{m^2}{2}\phi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi^4\right)^2\left\{\ln\frac{\kappa^2\left(2m^2 + \lambda\phi^2\right)\phi^2}{8\Lambda^2} - \frac{3}{2}\right\} \\ &+ \sum_{i=\pm}\frac{C_i^2}{64\pi^2}\left(\ln\frac{C_i}{\Lambda^2} - \frac{3}{2}\right) + \cdots,\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $C_\pm$ is

$$C_\pm = \frac{1}{2}\left[m_C^2 - m_A^2 \ \pm\sqrt{(m_C^2 + m_A^2)^2 - 16m_B^4}\right], \tag{5}$$

and

$$m_A^2 = \frac{\kappa^2}{8}\left(2m^2\phi^2 + \lambda\phi^4\right),\ m_B^2 = \frac{\kappa}{2}\left(m^2\phi + \lambda\phi^3\right),\ m_C^2 = m^2 + 3\lambda\phi^2. \tag{6}$$

In eq.(4), the first and the second terms are due to the graviton one-loops, third term due to graviton and Higgs one-loops. The ellipsis stands for terms including the one- and two-loops

of SM particles. Note that the factors κ^2 and κ^4 suppress the relevant (corresponding) terms at small scales of ϕ ($\phi \ll M_{\rm Pl}$). Gravity corrections give rise to logarithmically divergent terms of ϕ^6 and ϕ^8 in addition to the Λ^2 and $\ln\Lambda$ divergences in the ϕ^2 and ϕ^4 terms. The terms proportional to ϕ^6 and ϕ^8 are suppressed at usual energies, but they may become significant near $M_{\rm Pl}$. The quadratic and logarithmic divergences in the ϕ^2 and ϕ^4 terms may be renormalized in the usual way. Then, we obtain the full effective potential,

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\rm eff}(\phi) &= V_{\rm tree} + \delta V_{\rm loop} + V_{\rm counter} \\ &= \frac{m^2(\mu)}{2}\phi^2 + \frac{\lambda(\mu)}{4}\phi^4 \\ &+ \frac{3}{64\pi^2}\left(m^2(\mu)+\lambda(\mu)\phi^2\right)^2\left(\ln\frac{m^2(\mu)+\lambda(\mu)\phi^2}{\mu^2} - \frac{3}{2}\right) \\ &+ \frac{9\kappa^4}{256\pi^2}\left(\frac{m^2(\mu)}{2}\phi^2 + \frac{\lambda(\mu)}{4}\phi^4\right)^2\left\{\ln\frac{\kappa^2\left(2m^2(\mu)+\lambda(\mu)\phi^2\right)\phi^2}{8\Lambda^2} - \frac{3}{2}\right\} \\ &+ \sum_{i=\pm}\frac{C_i^2(\mu)}{64\pi^2}\left(\ln\frac{C_i(\mu)}{\Lambda^2} - \frac{3}{2}\right) \\ &- \frac{\kappa^2}{32\pi^2}\left(m^4(\mu)\phi^2 + 2\lambda(\mu)m^2(\mu)\phi^4\right)\ln\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{\mu^2}\right) + \frac{5\kappa^4}{512\pi^2}m^4(\mu)\phi^4\ln\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{\mu^2}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $m(\mu)$ and $\lambda(\mu)$ are renormalized parameters.

The effective Higgs potential including the loop corrections can be evaluated by using the RG. The β-functions in SM to the two-loop order have been computed [3, 15–17]. Some graviton loop corrections, as shown in Fig.1, have been computed [9, 10, 12, 13]. We have



Fig. 1 Graviton one-loop diagrams for the Higgs two- and four-point functions.

further calculated gravity corrections to other coupling constants, i.e., gauge and Yukawa couplings, as shown in Fig.2. We have obtained the β-functions and the anomalous dimen-



Fig. 2 Gravitaton one-loop diagrams for gauge couplings (a), Yukawa coupling ($b.1 \sim b.2$), anomalous dimension of Higgs ($c.1$) and anomalous dimension of fermion ($c.2 \sim c.3$).

sions due to the gravity one-loop corrections from the UV divergent terms of eq.(4) and these diagrams. The result is

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{m^2} &= \frac{5\kappa^2 m^2}{16\pi^2}\mu^2 - \frac{\kappa^2 m^4}{8\pi^2}, \quad \beta_\lambda = \frac{5\kappa^2\lambda}{16\pi^2}\mu^2 - \frac{\kappa^2\lambda m^2}{2\pi^2} - \frac{5\kappa^4 m^4}{64\pi^2}, \\ \beta_{g_i} &= \frac{5\kappa^2}{16\pi^2} g_i \mu^2, \quad \beta_{y_t} = \frac{\kappa^2}{2\pi^2} y_t \mu^2, \quad \gamma_\phi = -\frac{\kappa^2 m^2}{32\pi^2}, \quad \gamma_t = \frac{27\kappa^2}{512\pi^2}\mu^2.\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The energy flows of the Higgs quartic coupling $\lambda(\mu)$ and the effective potential $V(\phi)$ can be obtained by using the RG equations with the SM matter two-loop β-functions [3] and those due to the gravity loop corrections given in eq.(8). We employ the threshold values of the following quantities given by Degrassi et al [5],

$$\begin{aligned} g_Y(M_t) &= 0.45187, \quad g_2(M_t) = 0.65354, \\ g_3(M_t) &= 1.1645 - 0.00046\left(\frac{M_t - 173.15}{\text{GeV}}\right), \\ y_t(M_t) &= 0.93587 + 0.00557\left(\frac{M_t - 173.15}{\text{GeV}}\right) - 0.00003\left(\frac{M_H - 125}{\text{GeV}}\right), \\ \lambda(M_t) &= 0.12577 + 0.00205\left(\frac{M_H - 125}{\text{GeV}}\right) - 0.00004\left(\frac{M_t - 173.15}{\text{GeV}}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where g_Y, g_2, g_3 are the $U(1)$, $SU(2)$, $SU(3)$ gauge couplings respectively, y_t is the Yukawa coupling of top quark. We adjust the value of $m^2(M_t)$ so that $V(\phi)$ gives the correct vacuum expectation value, $v = 246\text{GeV}$ at $\mu = \mathcal{O}(100\text{GeV})$.

We investigate the following quantities:

i) μ-dependence of $\lambda(\mu)$,
ii) ϕ dependence of $V(\phi)$ near $\phi \simeq M_{\text{Pl}}$,
iii) Λ dependence of $V(\phi)$ near $\phi \simeq M_{\text{Pl}}$.

In the case without gravity corrections, the RG flows of $\lambda(\mu)$ are already known[3]. The gravity one-loop corrections to $\lambda(\mu)$ and $V(\phi)$ is tiny at scales $\mu \ll M_{\text{Pl}}$. Hence, below the Planck energy scale, the RG flows of $\lambda(\mu)$ and $V(\phi)$ nearly coincide with those of the SM only.

i) μ-dependence of $\lambda(\mu)$

We evaluate the running coupling $\lambda(\mu)$ by using the following equation,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\frac{\partial\lambda}{\partial\mu} &= \frac{5\kappa^2\lambda}{16\pi^2}\mu^2 - \frac{\kappa^2\lambda m^2}{2\pi^2} - \frac{5\kappa^4 m^4}{64\pi^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\left(24\lambda^2 - 3g_Y^2\lambda - 9g_2^2\lambda + \frac{3}{8}g_Y^4 + \frac{3}{4}g_Y^2 g_2^2 + \frac{9}{8}g_2^4 + 12\lambda y_t^2 - 6y_t^4\right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{(16\pi^2)^2}\left[-312\lambda^3 + 36\lambda^2\left(g_Y^2 + 3g_2^2\right) - \lambda\left(\frac{629}{24}g_Y^4 - \frac{39}{4}g_Y^2 g_2^2 + \frac{73}{8}g_4^2\right)\right. \\ &+ \frac{305}{16}g_2^6 - \frac{289}{48}g_Y^2 g_2^4 - \frac{559}{48}g_Y^4 g_2^2 - \frac{379}{48}g_Y^6 - 32g_3^2 y_t^4 - \frac{8}{3}g_Y^2 y_t^4 - \frac{9}{4}g_2^4 y_t^2 \\ &\left.+\lambda y_t^2\left(\frac{85}{6}g_Y^2 + \frac{45}{2}g_2^2 + 80g_3^2\right) + g_Y^2 y_t^2\left(-\frac{19}{4}g_Y^2 + \frac{21}{2}g_2^2\right) - 144\lambda^2 y_t^2 - 3\lambda y_t^4 + 30y_t^6\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

See ref [3] for the details of the parts of SM. Gravity corrections are noticeable around $\mu = \mathcal{O}(10^{18}\text{GeV})$, with a rapid increase in $\lambda(\mu)$, as seen from Fig.3. This behavior stops at

$\mu = (0.9 \sim 1.0) \times M_{\rm Pl}$, and they start to decrease $\lambda(\mu)$ sharply. $\lambda(\mu)$ becomes negative at $\mu \simeq M_{\rm Pl}$.



Fig. 3 Left: Energy dependence of $\lambda(\mu)$ for different values of $M_{\rm t}$, $M_{\rm t} = 174{\rm GeV}$(Green), 173GeV(Red), 172GeV(Blue). Right: The magnification of the Planck energy region.

ii) ϕ dependence of $V(\phi)$ near $\phi \simeq M_{\rm Pl}$

For $V(\phi)$, gravitational effects begin to be noticeable at $\phi = \mathcal{O}(10^{18}{\rm GeV})$, where ϕ^6 and ϕ^8 terms become dominant. In the region of $\phi < M_{\rm Pl}$, $V(\phi)$ is positive. In the region of $\phi = (0.8 \sim 0.9) \times M_{\rm Pl}$, $V(\phi)$ begins to be negative. At $\phi = 1.1 M_{\rm Pl}$, it takes a minimum. In the region of $\phi \gtrsim 1.1 M_{\rm Pl}$, $V(\phi)$ is rapidly increasing as seen in Fig.4. However, at such large values of ϕ, higher loop effects may be more dominant, and one cannot say anything reliable about the size (and the shape) of $V(\phi)$.



Fig. 4 $V(\phi)$ near $\phi \sim M_{\rm Pl}$ for different values of $M_{\rm t}$, $M_{\rm t} = 174{\rm GeV}$(Green), 173GeV(Red), 172GeV(Blue).

From i) and ii), we note that the graviton loop effects are essential to determine the stabilization of $V(\phi)$ in the Planck energy region. Fig.3 shows $\lambda(\mu)$ becomes negative at $\mu \simeq M_{\rm Pl}$. In the SM, $\lambda(\mu) < 0$ makes the $V(\phi)$ unstable. However, Fig.4 shows the potential is stable thanks to ϕ^6 and ϕ^8 terms which are given by the graviton loop corrections. Hence, the study of the potential stabilization requires the evaluation of the graviton loop effects as the energy approaches Planck mass scale.

We have so far taken a single fixed value of the cut-off, $\Lambda = 1 M_{\rm Pl}$ (in Fig.3 and Fig.4). We know that quantum corrections in the non-renormalizable Einstein gravity is cut-off

dependent and at best has only a limited meaning. It is still useful to know whether gravity corrections are negligibly small or as large as the SM corrections for the cut-off values in question in this study, $1M_{\rm Pl} < \Lambda < 3M_{\rm Pl}$. Hence we perform the study of iii) of the letter.



Fig. 5 $V(\phi)$ near $\phi \sim M_{\rm Pl}$ for different values of Λ, $\Lambda = 3M_{\rm Pl}$(Blue), $2M_{\rm Pl}$(Green), $1M_{\rm Pl}$(Red).

iii) Λ dependence of $V(\phi)$ near $\phi \simeq M_{\rm Pl}$
In the region of $\phi \gtrsim M_{\rm Pl}$, ϕ^6 and ϕ^8 terms are significant but they depend on the cut-off value Λ, as shown in Fig.5. $V(\phi)$ takes the minimum near $M_{\rm Pl}$, even if we change the cut-off value. Hence, in the graviton one-loop level, $V(\phi)$ has a minimum independent of the momentum cut-off value; the depth of the minimum depends strongly on Λ. The value of ϕ at the minimum, $\phi_{\rm min}$, increases with increasing Λ, but the dependence of $\phi_{\rm min}$ on Λ is rather mild. Hence, $V(\phi)$ takes the minimum at $\phi < \Lambda$ and $\phi_{\rm min}$ stay near $M_{\rm Pl}$ except the case of $\Lambda = 1M_{\rm Pl}$ in Fig.5 ($\phi_{\rm min}$ is somewhat larger in the case of $\Lambda = 1M_{\rm Pl}$, though).

In conclusion, evaluating the quantum gravity one-loop corrections to $V(\phi)$ in the SM coupled to Einstein's gravity theory with the momentum cut-off method, we have found a significant difference between $V(\phi)$ with both matter and gravity loop corrections and without gravity corrections near $\phi \simeq M_{\rm Pl}$. The results have given that the graviton loop effects are essential to know the stabilization of $V(\phi)$ near the Planck energy scales.

In previous work, it is suggested that the smallness of both λ and its β-function is consistent with the Higgs potential being flat around the string scale [11]. Our result agree with this suggestion. Actually, the gravity one-loop corrections is not significant in the region of $\phi \ll M_{\rm Pl}$. However, in the region of $\phi \gtrsim M_{\rm Pl}$, the shape of $V(\phi)$ changes drastically by gravity loop corrections. $V(\phi)$ with gravity corrections possesses a minimum at $\phi = \phi_{\rm min}$ somewhere $\phi \sim M_{\rm Pl}$, while $V(\phi)$ without gravity corrections increases monotonically as ϕ increases. The height of the potential minimum depends on Λ strongly. Whereas the location of $\phi_{\rm min}$ depends only weakly on Λ, the potential minimum exists regardless of Λ. In the graviton one-loop level, if the sign of λ is negative, the Higgs potential after including gravity corrections possesses the minimum somewhere near $\phi \simeq M_{\rm Pl}$ thanks to ϕ^6 and ϕ^8 terms. A study of the Higgs vacuum metastability including ϕ^6 and ϕ^8 terms has recently been made without referring to gravity loop corrections [18]. Because the Einstein gravity is non-renormalizable,

there may be different approaches for dealing with the UV divergent quantum corrections. For instance, Loebbert and Plefka introduce counter terms for the terms of ϕ^6 and ϕ^8 [9].

It has been proposed that the standard Higgs potential with the additional $\xi R\phi^2$ term may play a role of cosmological inflation [11, 19]. It is an interesting work to study the gravity loop corrections to Higgs field in this context [20].

We further should study UV renormalizable modified gravity theories without Λ dependence. Indeed, it has been proposed that R^2 gravity theory is UV renormalizable [21, 22]. A different approach has been taken in an early work [12]. In a future work, we will consider R^2 gravity as a modest step and evaluate the gravitational Coleman-Weinberg corrections to $V(\phi)$ in R^2 gravity.

Acknowledgements

It is our great pleasure to thank C. S. Lim and C. S. Chu for useful discussions and encouragement. M. H. benefited much from his visits to National Taiwan University. He wishes to thank P. M. Ho of National Taiwan University for hospitality and the financial support for the visits. We greatly appreciate valuable discussions with Y. Kawamura and K. Okuyama. This work was done partly while we were visiting RIKEN, Tsuboi lab of Chuo University. We wish to thank T. Hatsuda of RIKEN, Y. Tsuboi and Y. Sugawara of Chuo University for their kind hospitality.

References

[1] N. Cabibbo, L. Maiani, G. Parisi and R. Petronzio, Nucl. Phys. B **158**, 295 (1979).
[2] M. Spira and P. M. Zerwas, Lect. Notes Phys. **512**, 161 (1998).
[3] Y. Hamada, H. Kawai and K. Oda, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 053009 (2013).
[4] F. Bezrukov, M. Y. Kalmykov, B. A. Kniehl and M. Shaposhnikov, JHEP **1210**, 140 (2012).
[5] G. Degrassi, S. D. Vita, J. Elias-Miro, J. R. Espinosa, G. F. giudice, G. Isidori and A. Strumia, JHEP **1208**, 098 (2012).
[6] D. Buttazzo, G. Degrassi, P. P. Giardino, G. F. Giudice, F. Sala, A. Salvio and A. Strumia, JHEP **1312**, 089 (2013).
[7] A. Andreassen, W. Frost and M. D. Schwartz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 24, 241801 (2014).
[8] A. V. Bednyakov, B. A. Kniehl, A. F. Pikelner and O. L. Veretin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 20, 201802 (2015).
[9] F. Loebbert and J. Plefka, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **30**, 34, 1550189 (2015).
[10] N. Haba, K. Kaneta, R. Takahashi and Y. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 016004 (2015).
[11] Y. Hamada, H. Kawai and K. Oda, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 045009 (2015).
[12] L. Smolin, Phys. Lett. B **93**, 95 (1980)
[13] S. Bhattacharjee and P. Majumdar, Nucl. Phys. B **885**, 481 (2014).
[14] S. R. Coleman and E. J. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 1888 (1973).
[15] C. Ford, I. Jack and D. R. T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. B **387**, 373 (1992).
[16] K. G. Chetyrkin and M. F. Zoller, JHEP **1304**, 091 (2013).
[17] A. V. Bednyakov, A. F. Pikelner and V. N. Velizhanin, Nucl. Phys. B **875**, 552 (2013).
[18] V. Branchina and E. Messina, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 241801 (2013).
[19] F. L. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **659**, 703 (2008).
[20] I. D. Saltas, JCAP **1602**, 048 (2016).
[21] K. S. Stelle, Phys. Rev. D **16**, 953 (1977).
[22] E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, Nucl. Phys. B **201**, 469 (1982).